

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Applicant appreciates the interview with Examiner Syed Ali on January 14, 2004 in which currently amended claims were discussed. The Examiner indicated that the amendments to the claims appear to distinguish over the cited prior art, but that further searching would have to be performed.

CLAIMS

The Office Action dated 9/02/2003 rejected claims 1-25 and 27-35 and objected to claim 1. Claims 1, 17, 21-26, 29, 30, 31, 33, and 35 are amended by this amendment. New claims 36-44 are added. Claims 1 to 44 are currently pending in this application.

Claim Rejections

Claims 17, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite since there was insufficient antecedent basis for these claims. These antecedent basis errors have been corrected by this amendment.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10, 13-15, 17-18, and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 5,790,790 – hereinafter “Smith et al.”). Claim 1 is a method claim that has been amended to recite receiving a request to switch from a current network context that corresponds to a first user identity to a new network context that corresponds to a second user identity, and switching from the current network context to the new network

1 context without process shutdown. Smith et al. shows an electronic document
2 delivery system in which session contexts are switched during a session. The
3 language of Claim 1, as well as each independent claim, is amended to describe
4 each context corresponding to a distinct user identity. Smith et al. does not show
5 or suggest associating each context with a user identity. The Applicant therefore
6 submits that it is improper to maintain the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35
7 U.S.C. §103 over Smith et al.

8 The Applicant submits that claims 2-10, 13-15, and 17-18 that depend from
9 claim 1 are patentable over Smith et al. for at least these reasons. Applicant
10 respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 of these
11 claims.

12 **Claim 21** recites a computer readable medium claim including receiving a
13 request to switch from a first Internet context associated with a first user identity
14 to a second Internet context associated with a second user identity. Smith et al.
15 does not suggest receiving a request to switch (or switching) from one Internet
16 context associated with a first user identity to a second Internet context associated
17 with a second user identity without process shutdown. The Applicant therefore
18 submits that it is improper to maintain the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35
19 U.S.C. §103 over Smith et al. with respect to claim 21. The Applicant submits
20 that claims 22 to 24 that depend from claim 21 are patentable over Smith et al. for
21 at least these reasons.

22 **Claim 25** recites an Internet management object stored on a computer-
23 readable medium claim including the language "receiving a request to switch form
24 a first Internet context associated with a first user identity to a second Internet
25 context associated with a second user identity. Smith et al. does not show

1 switching between Internet contexts that are each associated with a respective user
2 identity. The Applicant therefore submits that it is improper to maintain the
3 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103 over Smith et al. with respect to
4 claim 25. The Applicant submits that claims 26 - 30 that depend from claim 25
5 are patentable over Smith et al. for at least these reasons.

6 **Claim 31** is a computer system claim that recites an Internet management
7 component being configured to halt processing of the first Internet context and
8 initialize processing by the second Internet context without shutting down other
9 processes when it receives a request to switch from the first user identity to the
10 second user identity. Smith et al. does not show switching between Internet
11 contexts that are each associated with a respective user identity without shutting
12 down the process. The Applicant therefore submits that it is improper to maintain
13 the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103 over Smith et al. with
14 respect to claim 31. The Applicant submits that claims 32-35 that depend from
15 claim 42 are patentable over Smith et al for at least these reasons.

16 The Applicant submits that claims 32-35 that depend from claim 31 are
17 patentable over Smith et al. for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully
18 requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 of these claims.

19
20 **35 U.S.C. § 103**

21 **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over
22 Smith et al., and further in view of Shoji et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,764,908 –
23 hereinafter Shoji et al.). Claim 1 (which claim 11 depends from) is a method
24 claim that has been amended to recite receiving a request to switch (and switching
25 without process shutdown) between to user identities, where each user identity

1 corresponds to a respective user identity. Smith et al. does not show switching
2 between a plurality of network contexts without process shutdown, where each
3 network context is associated with a respective user identity. Shoji et al. is not
4 relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Smith et al. as discussed above.
5 Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Smith et al.
6 and Shoji et al. does not disclose or suggest the method of claim 11. As such, the
7 Applicant submits that since claim 11 depends from claim 1, the rejection of claim
8 11 should be withdrawn and these claims allowed for at least these reasons.

9 **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over
10 Smith et al., and further in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,219,042
11 – hereinafter Anderson et al.). Claim 1 (which claim 12 depends from) is a
12 method claim that has been amended to recite receiving a request to switch (and
13 switching without process shutdown) between to user identities, where each user
14 identity corresponds to a respective user identity. Smith et al. does not show
15 switching between a plurality of network contexts without process shutdown,
16 where each network context is associated with a respective user identity.
17 Anderson et al. is not relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Smith et al. as
18 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the
19 combination of Smith et al. and Anderson et al. does not disclose or suggest the
20 method of claim 12. As such, the Applicant submits that since claim 12 depends
21 from claim 1, the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn and these claims
22 allowed for at least these reasons.

23 **Claims 19 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable
24 over Smith et al. and Melbin. Claim 1 (which claims 19 and 20 depend from) is a
25 method claim that recites receiving a request to switch (and switching without

1 process shutdown) between to user identities, where each user identity
2 corresponds to a respective user identity. Melbin does not show switching
3 between multiple network contexts without process shutdown. Melbin is not
4 relied upon by the Examiner in the Office Action to cure the deficiencies of Smith
5 et al. as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the
6 combination of Smith et al. and Melbin does not disclose or suggest the method of
7 claim 19 and 20. As such, the Applicant submits that since claims 19 and 20
8 depend from claim 1, the rejection of claims 19 and 20 should be withdrawn and
9 these claims allowed for at least these reasons.

10 **Claims 21-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable
11 over Smith et al. and Melbin. Claim 21 (which claims 22 and 23 depends from) is
12 a computer readable medium claim that recites receiving a request to switch (and
13 switching without process shutdown) between to user identities, where each user
14 identity corresponds to a respective user identity. Neither Smith et al. nor Melbin
15 show switching between multiple network contexts that are associated with
16 respective user identities without process shutdown. Melbin is not relied upon to
17 cure the deficiencies of Smith et al. as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant
18 respectfully submits that the combination of Smith et al. and Melbin does not
19 disclose or suggest the computer readable medium of claims 21 to 23. As such,
20 the Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 21 to 23 should be withdrawn
21 and these claims allowed for at least these reasons.

22 **Claims 25, and 27-30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being
23 unpatentable over Smith et al. and Melbin. Claim 25 (which claims 27-30 depend
24 from) is an Internet management object claim that recites receiving a request to
25 switch (and switching without process shutdown) between to user identities, each

1 user identity corresponds to a respective user identity. Neither Smith et al. nor
2 Melbin show switching between multiple network contexts that are associated
3 with respective user identities without process shutdown. Melbin is not relied
4 upon to cure the deficiencies of Smith et al. as discussed above. Accordingly,
5 Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Smith et al. and Melbin
6 does not disclose or suggest the Internet management object of claims 25, and 27-
7 30. As such, the Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 25, and 27-30
8 should be withdrawn and these claims allowed for at least these reasons.

9 **Claim 24** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over
10 Smith et al., Melbin, and further Anderson et al. Claim 21 (which claim 24
11 depends from) is a computer readable medium claim that recites receiving a
12 request to switch (and switching without process shutdown) between user
13 identities. Neither Melbin nor Anderson et al. show switching between multiple
14 network contexts that are associated with respective user identities without process
15 shutdown. Neither Melbin nor Anderson et al. are relied upon to cure the
16 deficiencies of Smith et al. as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant
17 respectfully submits that the combination of Smith et al., Melbin, and Anderson et
18 al. does not disclose or suggest the method of claim 24. As such, the Applicant
19 submits that since claim 24 depends from claim 21, the rejection of claim 24
20 should be withdrawn and this claims allowed for at least these reasons.

21 22 **Claim Objections**

23 **Claim 26** is objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim
24 (claim 25), but the Examiner has indicated that this claim would be allowable if
25 re-written in independent format. The Examiner has also objected to a redundant

1 clause in claim 25. As such, the present claim has amended the redundant clause
2 in claim 25. In addition, a new independent claim 44 is added that includes the
3 claim limitations of claims 25 and 26 (with the redundant limitation of claim 25
4 removed). As such, the Applicant submits that new claim 44 is allowable, as
5 indicated by the Examiner.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 Conclusion

3 In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests
4 reconsideration and allowance of the subject matter application.
5

6
7 Respectfully Submitted,

8 Lee & Hayes, PLLC
9 421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500
10 Spokane, WA 99201

11 Date: 2/27/04

12 By: Glenn B. Foster
13 Glenn B. Foster
14 Reg. No. 32,676
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25